

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-2 and 8-10 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found at least at Figs. 3-4 and pp. 17-25 of the originally filed specification. No new matter is added.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Heiny (U.S. 5,778,356) in view of Seiler et al. (U.S. Pat. 7,412,374, herein Seiler); and Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Heiny in view of Seiler and Krishnamurthy et al. (“Key differences between HTTP/1.0 and HTTP/1.1”, herein Krishnamurthy).

In response to the above noted rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 9 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 1, for example, recites an information service apparatus for providing information to a terminal in accordance with a request sent from the terminal, the information service apparatus comprising:

an operation panel configured to display operation information ...  
an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information ...  
a language determination part configured to determine the language to be used in providing said information, wherein  
when said language correspondence judgment part determines that said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the language selected by the selection received at said interface and ***currently used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel*** and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing said information.

Independent Claims 8-9, while directed to alternative embodiments, are similarly amended.

At p. 4, the Office Action concedes that Heiny fails to disclose "... acquires language data corresponding to the language ... used for displaying said operation on said operation panel and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing the information." In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, the Office Action relies on col. 5, ll. 23-24 of Seiler.

Generally, Seiler describes a portal system that identifies a language used to display content to a user. Col. 5, ll. 23-24 of Seiler describes that a user's browser may provide a list of languages, which can be used in constructing a ranked list of languages used to display data to the user.

Seiler, therefore, describes a process of selecting a language used to display information by the portal based on the users past browser settings, and fails to teach or suggest selecting a language *currently* used to display data on an operation panel, as claimed.

Thus, Heiny and Seiler, even if combined, fail to teach or suggest "... said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the language ... *currently used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel* and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing said information", as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 (and Claims 2-6, which depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn. For substantially similar reasons, it is also submitted that independent Claims 8-9 (and the claims that depend therefrom) patentably define over Heiny and Seiler.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Heiny and Seiler in view of Krishnamurthy, these claims depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Application No. 10/748,133  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2010

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Krishnamurthy fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of Heiny and Seiler.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-6 and 8-14 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 07/09)

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959